UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,264	05/17/2005	Kenichi Suzuki	000023-065	3874
	7590 10/26/200 INGERSOLL & ROOI	EXAMINER		
POST OFFICE	BOX 1404	CHRISS, JENNIFER A		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1794	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/26/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/535,264	SUZUKI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JENNIFER A. CHRISS	1794	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears o	n the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>12 October 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLI	CATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
	s: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the ith appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisor no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the	y Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ILY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO ch the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee and statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the AMENDMENTS 	thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but pri (a) They raise new issues that would require further consider (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corres NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. Set 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowab non-allowable claim(s). 	ee attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324) le if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
	ll not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of below or appended.
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	cient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Not entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overco showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and	me <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	e status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does See continuation sheet.	
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTO/13. ☐ Other:	SB/08) Paper No(s)
	/Jennifer A Chriss/
	Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

11. Applicant argues that Forbes teaches that the core polymer constitutes not less than 30% by weight of the fiber and in all the Examples of Forbes the sheath and core polymer each were contained 50% by weight of the filaments. As indicated in the previous Office Action, Forbes teaches that the sheath comprises about 20% by weight to about 70% by weight (see paragraph [0007] of Forbes), therefore, the core would be about 30% by weight to about 80% by weight. Due to the use of the term about in Forbes, the Examiner submitted that the claimed ranges would either overlap or are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. As shown by Table 3 of the Applicant's Specification, specifically examples 9 and 10, a fiber having a core being 50% by weight and a sheath being 50% by weight would have a lower extensibility at maximum load. Applicant has not shown that a fiber having a core constituting about 30% by weight would have a different extensibility at maximum load. It should be noted that it has been held that disclosed examples and preferred embodiments do not constitute a teaching away from a broader disclosure or nonpreferred embodiments. In re Susi, 440 F.2d 442, 169 USPQ 423 (CCPA 1971). In this case, it does not constitute a teaching away from a core being about 30% by weight. Applicant is reminded that evidence must provide a showing of critical and unexpected results and must be commensurate in scope with the claim. For these reasons, the rejection is maintained.